



REMARKS

Claim 2 is pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification, the drawings and claim 2 are amended. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to FIGS. 4A and 4B for not including the legend "Prior Art." FIGS. 4A and 4B have been amended to indicate that they show known subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Abstract

The Office Action objects to the abstract. Applicant has appended a substitute abstract. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 2 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 2 has been amended to correct informalities relating to antecedent basis. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,740,657 to Tsukagoshi et al. ("Tsukagoshi"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Tsukagoshi would not have rendered obvious claim 2. Claim 2 recites "[a] connection method, comprising: electrically connecting first electrodes on a first substrate and second electrodes on a second substrate with an interposed anisotropic electroconductive adhesive layer, wherein the thickness of the electroconductive adhesive layer prior to connection is given by: $0.5 \times \{(A^1C^1 + A^2C^2) / (B+C)\} \leq X \leq 2 \times \{(A^1C^1 + A^2C^2) / (B+C)\}$." Tsukagoshi does not teach or suggest such a method.



The Office Action asserts that Tsukagoshi discloses electrically connecting conductors on two substrates using an adhesive. Relying on *In re Boesch*, described in MPEP 2144.05 II.B, the Office Action asserts that the claimed relationship between electrode size, electrode arrangement and adhesive layer thickness merely reflects optimum values of result-effective variables that would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Notwithstanding these assertions, Tsukagoshi does not teach or suggest the claimed method.

First, as admitted in the Office Action, Tsukagoshi does not disclose the claimed relationship between electrode size, electrode arrangement and adhesive layer thickness. Second, the rationale that optimizing result-effective variables would have been obvious only applies if those variables are recognized in the prior art as result-effective. See MPEP 2144.05 II.B (citing *In re Antonie*). Tsukagoshi does not teach or suggest that the relationship between electrode size, electrode arrangement and adhesive layer thickness has any effect on performance, much less the beneficial effects of the particular relationship between these parameters set forth in claim 2. The present inventors, on the other hand, discovered that a particular relationship between electrode size, electrode arrangement and adhesive layer thickness will prevent adhesive from leaking during assembly, provide a connection having low conduction resistance and provide a connection supported by an adequate adhesive bond. See instant specification, p. 3, ll. 1-11, Examples. As Tsukagoshi does not recognize the claimed parameters as result-effective, it cannot be said that optimizing those parameters would have been obvious. For at least these reasons, Tsukagoshi does not teach or suggest the method of claim 2.

Tsukagoshi would not have rendered claim 2 obvious. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.




Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claim 2 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jacob A. Doughty
Registration No. 46,671

JAO:JAD/hs

Date: October 23, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
